

MINUTES

CALIFORNIA TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES COMMITTEE (CTCDC) MEETING

Los Angeles, November 17, 2005

The last CTCDC meeting of year 2005 was held in Los Angeles, on November 17, 2005.

Chairman John Fisher opened the meeting at 9:10 a.m. with the introduction of Committee members and guests. Chairman Fisher thanked Caltrans District 7 for hosting the meeting. Frank Quan, Office Chief, Traffic Operation Branch, thanked the Committee members for selecting the Distinct 7 Office for the CTCDC meeting. The following Members, alternates and guests were in attendance:

<u>ATTENDANCE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TELEPHONE</u>
Members (Voting)		
John Fisher Chairman	League of CA Cities City of Los Angeles	(213) 972-8424
Farhad Mansourian Vice Chairman	CA State Association of Counties Marin County	(415) 499-6570
Gerry Meis	Caltrans	(916) 654-4551
Ed von Borstel	League of CA Cities City of Modesto	(209) 577-5266
Merry Banks	California State Automobile Association	(415) 565-2297
Jacob Babico	CA State Association of Counties San Bernardino County	(909) 387-8186
Hamid Bahadori	Auto Club of Southern California	(714) 885-2326

ATTENDEES

ORGANIZATION

TELEPHONE/E-Mail

Matt Benjamin	LA Bicycle Coalition	matt@labikecoalition.org
Robert Scharf	LA County, DPW	bscharf@ladpw.org
Jason Nutt	City of Santa Rosa	jnutt@srcity.org
Walter Laabs	City of Santa Rosa	wlaabs@srcity.org
Cathy Thunstorm	MTA	thunstorm@metro.net
Percy Green	D7	percy_green@dot.ca.gov
Lewis Yee	D7	lewis_yee@dot.ca.gov
Chand Dornsife	RHSPI	cdornsife@bhspi.org
Nader Asmer	LADOT	nasmer@dot.lacity.org
Beyawin Chan	LADOT	bchan@dot.lacity.org
Cindy Watson	Oceanside	cwatson@ci.oceanside.ca.us
David Royer	Consultant	droyerpe@earthlink.net
Johnny Bhullar	Caltrans-HQ	johnny_bhullar@dot.ca.gov
Frank Watanabe	Oceanside	fwatanabe@ci.oceanside.ca.us
Kevin McLaughlin	MUD	kmclaughlin@mudhzo.com
Ed Krulikowski	City of El Cajon	ekrukowski@ci.el-cajon.ca.us
Bob Collins	City of San Diego	
Tedi Jackson	City of San Diego	
Mike Sallaberry	SF-DPT	mike.sallaberry@sfgov.org
Michele Mowry	LADOT	mmowery@dot.lacity.org
Michael Uyeno	LADOT	muyeno@dot.lacity.org

MINUTES

Adoption of July 28, 2005 CTCDC meeting minutes.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by Jacob Babico, to adopt the Minutes of July 28, 2005 CTCDC meeting held in Sacramento, California. Motion carried 7-0.

Election of Officers

Motion: Moved by Jacob Babico, seconded by Ed von Borstel, to elect Farhad Mansourian as Chairman of the CTCDC. Motion carried 7-0.

Motion: Moved by Merry Banks, seconded by Farhad Mansourian, to elect Hamid Bahadori as Vice Chairman of the CTCDC. Motion carried 7-0.

Public Comments:

Chairman Fisher asked for public comments on any item not appearing on the agenda.

Chad Dornsife commented that the use of internally illuminated markers could benefit certain roadways that have sharp curves or a cloverleaf type interchange. He stated that he has noticed tire marks which indicates vehicles leaving the roadway and hitting the outside barriers. The marks are clearly visible on the pavement and on the barriers. The internally illuminated markers could reduce the incidents tremendously and they have been included in the MUTCD 2003.

04-E California MUTCD Adoption (FHWA's MUTCD 2003 Revision 1, as Amended for Use in California), Formerly known as "Combining of the MUTCD 2003 and California Supplement to a Single Document"

Chairman Fisher asked Caltrans to provide an update on the adoption of the California MUTCD.

Devinder Singh provided brief information on the status of combining the MUTCD 2003 and California Supplement. Parts 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 were posted on the website for public comments. The comments were received on these Parts and they were discussed during the CTCDC Workshop held on November 16, 2005. The remaining Parts 2, 3 and 4 will be posted on the website by mid December for public comments. A subsequent CTCDC Workshop will be held to discuss comments received on these Parts. The item will be placed on the CTCDC agenda for the February meeting requesting the Committee for recommendations for the adoption of the document.

Chairman Fisher added that several years ago (1999) Caltrans proposed to adopt the MUTCD in California. The new document will be called the California MUTCD. Caltrans staff and CTCDC members held a number of workshops to discuss the comments received from public agencies, consultants and from private citizens. The result of that, as of May 20, 2004, California has adopted the MUTCD 2003 as amended by the California Supplement to prescribe uniform standards and specifications for all official traffic control devices in California. After the adoption of the two documents, practitioners noticed that it is not practical to follow two documents for implementing standards. Committee members requested Caltrans to combine both documents into a single document. Gerry Meis' office took on the responsibility. Johnny Bhullar did a tremendous job to complete this task. On November 16, 2005 a workshop was held to discuss comments on Parts 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. There were about 50 pages of comments received from individuals. The Committee will address the outstanding issues and comments received on Parts 2, 3 and 4 during the upcoming workshop. The document will be a dynamic document and will be helpful to end-users.

Jacob Babico stated that Valley Traffic Engineers Association (which represents various cities of San Bernardino County and Riverside County) claimed that the proposed format of the California MUTCD is confusing, because of the color version and the strike out parts. Some individual does not have options to print in color and strikeouts portion is not readable.

Gerry Meis stated that there were no comments received on the format so far except Jacob's today. The purpose of color text is to identify the text added by California and strikeouts identifies the text deleted from the MUTCD 2003 that is not applicable in California. If an individual does not have the option to print in a color, a pair of vertical lines also identifies the added text, there should not be any confusion to identify the addition and deletion of text since it is highlighted with more than one option.

Other Committee members also agreed with Gerry's comments.

The Committee members decided to continue the combining process and will see the reaction of the end users.

05-11 Proposal to Amend MUTCD Section 7A.01

Chairman Fisher stated that the amendment to the MUTCD Section 7A.01 was proposed by him. Section 7A.01 of the MUTCD 2003 requires a public agency to prepare a school route plan for each school serving elementary to high school students. It should be prepared in order to develop uniformity in the use of school area traffic controls and to serve as the basis for a school traffic control plan for each school. He believes no agency prepares a school route plan for the middle/high school and this language could be a tort liability issue for a public agency. He further added that younger children are most vulnerable to collisions. Also, maps for them cover a small, defined area. On the other hand, maps less influence older children. In addition, middle schools/high schools cover an area over several square miles and it is not feasible to identify every route from tens of thousands of homes to the schools. A few may draw from the nearby community. However, they tend to draw from a very broad, regional area, and thus, the children are driven. As noted above, he proposed to amend the MUTCD 2003, Section 7A.01, as follows:

Guidance:

A school route plan for each school serving elementary ~~to high school~~ students should be prepared in order to develop uniformity in the use of school area traffic controls and to serve as the basis for a school traffic control plan for each school.

Option:

A school route plan for each school serving middle school or high school students may be prepared.

Chairman Fisher opened discussion amongst Committee members.

Gerry Meis stated that he would rather hear comments from the local agency representatives in regards to the proposed language.

Jacob Babico stated that California Vehicle Code (CVC), Section 21373 states that, “the governing board of any school district may request the appropriate city, county, city and county or state agency to install traffic control devices in accordance with the warrants established pursuant to Section 21372.” If the proposed language is adopted, then the question becomes who will prepare the school route map for middle school or high school if there is a request for one.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the majority of public agencies currently do not prepare school route maps for the middle/high school. There is no law mandating this requirement. If a public agency believes there is a need based on the request from a school district, then they will prepare one, however, there is a no law which mandates school route maps. If the Committee leaves the language as it is shown in the MUTCD 2003, then public agencies would find ways to avoid school route maps for even elementary schools. He supported the adoption of the amended language.

Chairman Fisher asked Jacob whether his agency currently prepares school route maps for middle/high schools.

Jacob responded no. However, with the proposed language the public agency can opt not to prepare a school route map.

Chairman Fisher stated that even now, the majority of public agencies do not have to prepare a school route maps for middle school or high school. The proposed language would lessen the tort liability and would not change the current practice in California.

Chairman Fisher asked for public comments.

Ed Krulikowski, Acting Director of Public Works, City of El Cajon stated that he agrees with the proposed amendment. He further stated that the school route guidelines are listed in the Education Code not in the CVC.

Chad Dornsife stated that the MUTCD standards are minimum standards and states do not have authority to change them. If a state wants to deviate, then they are required to document reasons based on engineering judgement or engineering study.

Gerry Meis commented that the Committee is not changing the standards, the Committee is amending the guidance statement.

Johnny Bhullar stated that based on discussion, the policy is not practical to use. However, he suggested changing the policy by using the proper process. The Committee should consider writing to the MUTCD team and ask for a revision of the Section as proposed. He further added that engineering judgement could justify deviation from the guidance statements. Johnny also informed the Committee that Caltrans Traffic Safety Branch supports to keep the MUTCD language.

Chairman Fisher stated that Caltrans Traffic Safety Branch wants to keep the current language and on the other hand no one is obligated to prepare the school routes maps for middle school or high school. Preparing a map for the middle school or high school is not practical, because of the area covered under the school boundary. Therefore, why not amend the language and lessen the tort liability.

Farhad Mansourian stated that Marin County implemented a safe route to school program and has won a national award. However, if his jurisdiction has to prepare school route maps for the middle school or high school, he might not consider it. He further added that Jason Nutt, City of Santa Rosa was involved in this program and he invited Jason to share his experience.

Jason Nutt, City of Santa Rosa, stated that while he was working with Marin County, the County undertook a program to develop a safe route to school program. The County hired a consultant who visited the individual schools with the Parent Teachers Association (PTA). They generally identified the routes walking to and from the school. The maps were not prepared, however educational tools were prepared to educate parents, students and school officials. The main focus was to provide education to students and parents about the safe route to school. The overall program was a success.

Chairman Fisher asked Jason if he is considering the same program for the City of Santa Rosa.

Jason responded no.

Hamid Bahadori commented that the proposed language does not lower the standards. This is guidance, and secondly, this proposal has nothing to do with safety of the transportation system. He was not sure how this was included to the MUTCD.

Chairman Fisher asked for any other comments on the proposal.

Farhad Mansourian stated that he supports the adoption of the amendment.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Ed von Borstel, recommended adoption of the proposed amendment to MUTCD Section 7A.01 as presented in the agenda.

Motion Carried 6-1 (Jacob Babico voted against the motion).

Action: Item completed.

**04-6 Proposed School Bus Sign, “Do not Pass Stopped School Bus, Flashing Red Lights”
Increased Fines Apply CVC 22454.5**

Chairman Fisher asked Jacob Babico to introduce agenda item 04-6 “Do not Pass Stopped School Bus, Flashing Red Lights.”

Jacob stated that this item was reagendaized on behalf of Ventura County’s request. Originally, this item was discussed in 2004 and during the discussion the Committee requested more information from the County. Jacob introduced Mr. Nazir Lalani and asked him to present the proposal to the Committee.

Nazir Lalani stated that the County is requesting experimental approval for a stationary sign, “Do not Pass Stopped School Bus, Flashing Red Lights”. The proposed signs will be installed along a six-mile stretch of Santa Rosa Street in an unincorporated area. Santa Rosa Street has two lanes, one lane in each direction with a two-way left turn lane. The residents requested installation of signs because a number of motorists do not stop when school busses flash their red lights. The signs are a part of an effort to educate drivers to comply with provisions of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22454. Nazir stated that the County would not be able to collect before and after data because of staff limitations.

Chairman Fisher opened discussion amongst Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori commented that from the presentation it seems that the problem is very limited and it is not even in the entire Ventura County except Santa Rosa Street.

Gerry Meis stated that currently there is a real time stop sign behind the bus that is supplemented with red flashing lights. If motorists do not follow that sign, he doubts whether the stationary sign would influence motorists. He further stated that if the County wants experimental approval, he definitely wants to see the before and after data collected to determine whether the sign will have any influence on the motorists or not.

Chairman Fisher added that his position is the same as Gerry’s. If the Committee receives evidence on how many motorists do not stop before and what improvements the sign achieves, then the Committee can see if the sign is a success or failure.

Farhad Mansourian stated that if the County follows the CTCDC experimental process, then he would support it for approval. However, the County has indicated that they are not in a position to collect before and after data, therefore, he cannot support the approval of the experimentation.

Chairman Fisher asked for other comments from the Committee members and audiences.

There were none.

Motion: Moved by Farhad Mansourian, seconded by Hamid Bahadori, due to lack of demonstrated existing problem and inability to comply with the requirements of experiment guidelines, the experiment request was denied.

Motion carried 7-0

Action: Item is completed.

05-6 Experiment with #399 Motorist Aid Freeway Signing

Chairman Fisher asked Gerry Meis to introduce agenda item 05-6, experiment with #399 sign.

Gerry stated that this item is a continuation from the last meeting. During the last meeting, the Committee asked for more information from Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFEs). Gerry invited Cathy Thunstrom and asked her to present the #399 sign request to the Committee.

Cathy stated that Los Angeles County SAFE is requesting, on behalf of all California SAFEs, approval of new statewide information signs which can be used to replace the current "Emergency - Call 9-1-1" signs. The replacement would add information on the new non-emergency motorist aid number/service - #399. In addition, a new sign is proposed to inform motorists that they are leaving an area that has #3-9-9 service. These signs would only be installed in counties/regions that have implemented a #399 program. Cathy added that the sign has been revised as suggested by the Committee during the last meeting. As requested by the Committee during the last meeting, a support letter from the Southern California Highway Patrol for the program handed out to the Committee members.

The proposed signage is shown on the following page:

Chairman Fisher asked Committee members whether they had any questions for Cathy.

Gerry Meis asked if this program could also be used for the surface street. Secondly, if you receive a call that is related to an emergency, how would the agency handle the call? Thirdly, who will answer these calls?

Cathy stated that at this time the program is only for freeways, however they are looking to expand the program to include surface streets. If SAFE's operator receives a call, which is related to an emergency, that call will be routed to an appropriate agency. The calls will be answered by the same operators as were answered for the call boxes. Cathy further added that the program is already in place and SAFE used radio, television and flyers to educate people about the program. The signs will be in addition to the ongoing campaign and also emphasize the beginning and ending points of the program.

Chairman Fisher asked that since the program is already under way, he clarified that what Cathy is asking for from the Committee is approval for the experimental signs.

Cathy responded yes.

Hamid stated that the CHP letter has reservations, to discontinue its involvement in case the program fails to provide an adequate level of safety and service to the motoring public.

Cathy responded that the SAFE will work closely with CHP to address all the concerns and as stated in the CHP letter, there will be a weekly meeting to sort out all the concerns.

Gerry Meis stated that the sign specs and policy be developed with the assistance of his Office.

Cathy stated that the proposed signs were developed with the assistance of Caltrans District 7 Office, however, if any changes are needed to the size and specs, SAFE will coordinate with your Office.

Hamid stated that the proposed message should be the only message to be used on the final sign.



Chairman Fisher asked other comments from the Committee members and from audiences.

There were none.

Motion: Moved by Hamid Bahadori, seconded by Gerry Meis, recommend approving the signs as proposed and the final sign shall meet Caltrans Standard and Specifications.

Motion carried 7-0

Action: Item approved for experimentation.

Discussion Items:

05-12 Guidelines for Engineering and Traffic Surveys to Establish Speed Limits

Chairman Fisher Asked Ed von Borstel to introduce agenda item 05-12.

Ed von Borstel stated that the adoption of the Federal manual, MUTCD 2003 as amended by the California Supplement, creates some confusion amongst public agencies in the development of speed limits. The City of Santa Rosa has submitted a request to restore the 1996 Traffic Manual guidelines instead of the language adopted in California Supplement. Ed invited Walter Laabs to address his request to the Committee.

Walter Laabs thanked the Committee for placing his request on the agenda as a discussion item. He requested the Committee to recommend Caltrans to replace the current guideline of the California Supplement with the 1996 Traffic Manual. The current guidelines under California Supplement, Section 2B.116, page 2B-51 states that the speed limit should be established at the nearest 10 km (5-mph) increment to the 85th percentile speed. However, the 1996 Traffic Manual says that the speed limit normally should be established at the first 5 mph increment below the 85th percentile speed.

Walter cited an example: In Santa Rosa, there is 4.5 mile long arterial in hilly terrain. In response to a settlement of litigation, the road is designed for a design speed of 35 mph. Sight distance at crest and sag vertical curves, and intersection approaches is limited by the design speed. After the street was opened to traffic, an engineering and traffic survey was completed to establish a speed limit that could be enforced by radar. The 85th percentile speed was 40 mph and, based on engineering judgement due to the limited sight distance as a result of the design speed of 35 mph, the speed limit was established at 35 mph. Seven years later a new engineering and traffic survey was conducted. The 85th percentile speed was 43.4 mph. Using the guidelines from the traffic Manual we could have rounded down to the next 5 mph increment and used engineering judgement to keep speed limit at 35 mph and continue to use radar enforcement. When we use the guidance contained in the MUTCD 2003 California Supplement, we have to set the base speed limit to the nearest 5 mph increment to 45 mph and apply engineering judgement to lower the speed limit to 40 mph. Walter requested to place this item under the action item for the upcoming meeting.

Chairman Fisher opened discussion amongst Committee members.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the design speed of a roadway itself is a justification to post design speed as a speed limit.

Chairman Fisher asked if the current language in the California Supplement gives discretion to establish a lower speed to the 85th percentile speed?

Walter responded yes it does. However, the point is that this particular revised language changes the parameters for the establishment of speed limits.

Chairman Fisher stated that by rewriting the California Supplement and reviewing the MUTCD 2003 language the Committee tried to bring the California Supplement language close to the MUTCD 2003. The main focus was to avoid the speed trap. In the past, agencies have misused the 1996 Traffic Manual guidelines to justify lower speeds. He stated that the speed limit should be established in such a way that motorist obeys it. Motorists usually would ignore arbitrarily established speed limits on a roadway.

Ed von Borstel stated that the posted speeds that correspond to the 85th percentile operating speed are normally appropriate, even where they are higher than the design speed, because they promote uniformity of speeds which has its own safety benefits associated with it.

Jacob pointed out that there is a discrepancy in the California Supplement language, on page 2B-51 last paragraphs, first sentence states:

“the speed limit should be established at the nearest 10 km/h (5 mph) increment to the 85th percentile speed.”

Page 2B-53, seventh paragraph, first sentence states:

“Speed limits are established at or near the 85th percentile speed, which is defined as that speed at or below which 85th percent of the traffic is moving.”

Hamid stated that there is no discrepancy, because on page 2B-53 the first sentences explained what is a 85th percentile.

Chairman Fisher asked comments from the public.

Johnny Bhullar stated that the MUTCD Section 2B.13 under guidance states that, *“the speed limit should be within 10 km (5 mph) of the 85th percentile speed of free-flowing traffic.”* When the California Supplement Section 2B.116, page 2B-51 states, *“speed limit should be established at the nearest 10 km/h (5 mph) increment to the 85th percentile speed. However, in matching existing conditions with the traffic safety needs of the community, engineering judgement may indicate the need for a further reduction of 10 km/h (5 mph).”* California language gives options to the engineers to go further below 5 mph, if conditions are warranted. The adopted California language makes practitioners stay close to the 85th percentile rather going lower and lower creating a speed trap based on old guidelines.

Chad Dornsife stated that the federal law requires being within 5 mph of the 85th percentile. He further added that he has published a paper on how to establish speed limit, and if anybody is interested he can provide a copy.

Ed Krulikowski, Acting Director, Public Works Department, City of El Cajon, handed three letters to the Committee members, two from the City of El Cajon (written by ED Krulikowski and second from the Police Department) and the third on behalf of the San Diego Regional Traffic Engineer's Council (SANTEC). Ed stated that in his opinion, the California Supplement language is significantly different than the previous 1996 State Traffic Manual. If the language is not changed, it will lead to establishing higher speed limits on local streets and roads as well as forcing the upward zone to the nearest 5 mph increment. Depending on the individual case, it may even lead to creating a speed limit based on the 90th percentile or greater depending on each case. When an agency combines the new language with the court's tendency to require citations to be issued at 10 mph or greater over the existing speed limit, it will mean that virtually 100% of the driver will be non-citable.

Ed further stated that the current policy was potentially a reaction to the arbitrary reducing of speed limits by certain city officials. He requested the Committee to recognize his concerns expressed in the letter as well as other information that will surely follow and take a proactive role in assuring that the speed limit language as currently exists in the California Supplement is changed to reflect the previous State Traffic Manual language. He further requested the Committee to place this item as an action item for the upcoming meeting.

Hamid Bahadori stated that he understands the emotional part, however if you look at the accident statistics for speed related accidents, since 1980, there is no change and even the speed related accidents are lower now compared to 1980.

Ed responded that by adopting the California Supplement language the speed limit in certain conditions would be over the 85th percentile, and in certain conditions it would be 90%. When the speed is rounded upward it would be above the 85th percentile. All the members of SANTEC strongly support to place this item as an action item for the upcoming CTCDC meeting. SANTEC would bring more data to justify their request to restoring the old State Traffic Manual language to the California Supplement.

Jason Nutt, City of Santa Rosa stated that one of the concerns is that the local jurisdiction is not aware of how to use the new guidelines, and Santa Rosa is experiencing the same problem. To justify lowering the speed limit with new guidelines, someone has to be creative. Even though it is a "should" condition, not "shall", there needs to be extra tolls to establishing the speed limit lower than the 85th percentile. The problem is that if reasons are properly documented to justify lowering the speed, then the citation will be thrown out. He further added that in certain conditions, agencies have to deviate, such as safety corridors. The courts want the speed limit to be established by using proper guidelines.

Hamid stated that even though the language is a "should" condition, however the CVC requires the speed limit must be established according to the guidelines adopted by the Department of Transportation.

Chairman Fisher asked Ed Krulikowski if he would support the adoption of MUTCD 2003 language.

Ed responded no, we would prefer the Committee to adopt the 1996 Traffic Manual language, but that he would support the MUTCD over the Current Section.

Chairman Fisher stated that the Committee had an extensive discussion while working on this topic during the adoption of the MUTCD 2003 as amended by the California Supplement. He asked the opinion of Committee members, since the City of Santa Rosa requested to place this item as an action item.

Jacob Babico stated that while the Committee was working on this topic during the workshop, the Committee knew that there is a discrepancy between the MUTCD language and in California Supplement. The final language was developed by a Caltrans individual, which was never discussed during the MUTCD workshop.

Johnny Bhullar responded that the language was developed by the Caltrans individual and it was posted at the website for open comments. There was no comments received either from the Committee members or from the public.

Chairman Fisher asked the Committee members opinion to place this item as an action item for the upcoming CTCDC meeting.

Farhad Mansourian stated that the Committee recommended revised language for adoption after going through the established public hearing process. The City of Santa Rosa and the City of El Cajon do not like the language which was adopted for the establishment of speed limit and is requesting to replace the current California Supplement language with the 1996 Traffic Manual language. They are further requesting placing this item on the agenda as an action item. He stated that if the rest of the Committee wants to place this item on the agenda, it is fine with him. However, he does not want to set precedence, for another agency to come to the Committee saying that they do not like another policy. If the Committee chooses to go that way, it will be a never ending process. He further added that in the worst

case scenario, the speed limit could be 2 mph over the 85th percentile speed. In the past, agencies have misused the system, if an 85th percentile was 44 mph, they could justify 35 mph which is a speed trap in most cases. Based on the current language, if the 85th percentile is 44 mph, an agency cannot justify less than 40 mph, he believes that this is a reasonable speed limit for that roadway. Without justification, the speed limit would be 45 mph, because it should be rounded to the nearest to the 85th percentile speed. He commented that when a speed limit is not posted based on the majority of drivers' speeds, then the motorist does not obey the speed limit and overall, the agency loses respect from the motoring public.

Chairman Fisher asked again if there was a need for the continuation of the item.

Jacob Babico stated that he supports placing this item on the agenda as an action item for the next CTCDC meeting.

Chairman Fisher asked whether other members support Jacob's request.

There was no other member who endorsed Jacob's proposal.

Chairman Fisher stated that since six members out of seven do not want to continue with this issue, the item is concluded. He thanked the City of Santa Rosa and the City El Cajon.

00-1 Bicycle Pavement Marking

Chairman Fisher asked Ed von Borstel to address the Bicycle Pavement Marking (BPM) item.

Ed von Borstel stated that the City of San Francisco has studied the bicycle pavement marking (BPM) with the approval of CTCDC. The Committee recommended adoption of the BPM, however the final policy does not allow the use of BPM on the roadways without an on-site parking. The City wants to include that option in the policy. Ed introduced Mike Sallaberry and requested him to present this item to the Committee.

Mike stated the City believes that the BPM could be beneficial at certain roadways without parking. The BPM could be especially useful where there are angled parking and on narrow roadways. Mike stated that the recommended language by the CTCDC to Caltrans has the provision to allow BPM at the roadway without parking. He further added that Caltrans has some concerns to allow BPM on a roadway with no parking. However, he believes the BPM could be useful on roadways with no parking in certain conditions. He requested the Committee to continue this item and place it on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting as an action item.

Chairman Fisher asked Committee members if they have any comments.

Gerry Meis stated that he supports to place this item on the agenda as an action item. However, he is uncomfortable with the adoption of the BPM in California, because the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD), who advises the FHWA on MUTCD, has rejected it. He further added that when the Committee recommended adoption for the BPM during the August 2004 meeting, a representative from the national committee/member of the bicycle advisory committee (BAC) stated that FHWA would be adopting a similar BPM. The national committee will be making final recommendations to FHWA to include BPM in the MUTCD.

Chairman Fisher stated that he was supportive too at that time, because of the testimony from Richard Mouer, Member of the Nation BAC and member of the NCUTCD. He stated that FHWA was going a different direction and he would like to see an update on the national status during the next CTCDC meeting.

Mike stated that he has spoken with Richard Mouer and he still believes that the BPM will make it to the National Manual.

Gerry Meis stated that the California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 212002 states as follows:

Operation on Roadway

21202. (a) Any person operating a bicycle upon a roadway at a speed less than the normal speed of traffic moving in the same direction at that time shall ride as close as practicable to the right-hand curb or edge of the roadway except under any of the following situations:

- (1) When overtaking and passing another bicycle or vehicle proceeding in the same direction.
- (2) When preparing for a left turn at an intersection or into a private road or driveway.
- (3) When reasonably necessary to avoid conditions (including, but not limited to, fixed or moving objects, vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, animals, surface hazards, or substandard width lanes) that make it unsafe to continue along the right-hand curb or edge, subject to the provisions of Section

21656. For purposes of this section, a "substandard width lane" is a lane that is too narrow for a bicycle and a vehicle to travel safely side by side within the lane.

(4) When approaching a place where a right turn is authorized.

(b) Any person operating a bicycle upon a roadway of a highway, which highway carries traffic in one direction only and has two or more marked traffic lanes, may ride as near the left-hand curb or edge of that roadway as practicable.

Gerry asked Mike what is a non-standard lane width when bikes can move to the left.

Mike responded that 14 feet lane width is considered standard for the bike and a motor vehicle to drive side by side under normal conditions. 10 feet is a sub-standard lane width and 12 feet lane width is a gray area. The BPM at 10/11 feet lane width will allow bikes to take full lane.

Matt Benjamin, Los Angeles Bicycle Coalition Committee supported City of San Francisco request placing this item on the agenda as an action item. He stated that bicycle pavement markers would be useful on certain roadways without parking.

Chairman Fisher asked the Committee members whether they would support placing this item under action item for the next CTCDC meeting.

There was a unanimous decision to place this item on the agenda for the next CTCDC meeting as an action items.

Chairman Fisher asked Mike if the City could collect some data before the next meeting, to find out whether the bikers understand the meaning to take full lane in the case of a sub-standard lane width.

Mike responded that he would try.

Action: Place the item on the agenda for the next meeting as an action items.

5-10 Proposal for the Watershed Boundary Sign

Chairman Fisher asked the City of San Diego, Water District to present their proposal on “watershed” signs.

Bob Collins and Tedi Jackson presented their proposal by using PowerPoint. Bob stated that the San Diego Regional Water Quality Board strongly supports development and implementation of a statewide watershed and waterway signage program. The Water District believes such a program would do much to encourage and increase awareness and stewardship of watersheds, waterways, natural resources, beneficial uses of water, and water quality in California. Bob further stated that they understand that the Department of Transportation and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection have implemented a watershed signage program in parts of Northern California.

Bob added that they have received over 20 letters of support. Since the last CTCDC meeting they have received a letter from the San Diego County Water Authority, Ramona Chamber of Commerce, California Regional Water Quality Control Board (San Diego region) and Southern California Wetlands Recovery Task Force. Bob stated that in addition to the signage installation, the Water District would create a supplemental public service campaign and communities outreach plan and continue efforts to educate the community about “What is a watershed? They will launch a Pilot Program in San Diego . Collect community feedback on the program.

Bob requested to place this item on the next CTCDC agenda meeting as an action item.

Hamid Bahadori asked whether a logo shown one of the slides is a San Diego Water District logo. Bob responded no, it is a universal logo.

Chairman Fisher asked if they have support from the State Water Board and whether they will encourage other water agencies to use the same sign in case they would like implement the same program.

Bob responded that they would have support letter from the State Water Control Board during the next meeting.

Hamid commented that some of the slides show a sponsor’s name on the proposed sign. He stated that sponsors names might not be a good idea because Caltrans has a similar program, which is known as “adopt the highway” sign.

Bob responded that the addition of sponsor's names was an idea and this can be removed with no problem.

Gerry Meis stated that there are number of questions, first of all, he believes that this is not a traffic control device and therefore it does not falls under the purview of the Committee.

Hamid stated that a few slides show proposed watershed signs supplemented with recreational signs. There are existing recreational signs and if there are facilities available, the current signs could be used. He suggested keeping watershed sign as a stand alone sign.

Bob responded that during the last meeting it was suggested that the addition of other public service signs might be helpful to justify a watershed sign. Bob talks about the placement of signs. There will be a sign indicating “entering watershed area” and at the end will be a sign “leaving the water shed area”. Bob shared the last slide and indicated that San Diego has the largest recreation area.

Farhad asked Bob that if Committee denies your proposal, then what options would you have.

Bob responded that they would look at other avenues.

Gerry Meis commented that the adopt-a-highway sign was created through legislation. Gerry asked whether motorists would understand the purpose of the sign.

Bob responded that water quality is very important for the San Diego area. What we will do, we will start a pilot program and collect data to see if motorists understand the meaning of the sign and whether the sign will have any impact on the motoring public.

Merry Banks commented that she likes the program and would like to see the Committee take leadership and approve the pilot program.

Gerry Meis suggested having a bill through legislation.

Farhad Mansourian stated that the Committee is not sure if this is traffic control device, however the Committee supports the program and would support legislation for the adoption of the program.

Hamid Bahadori stated that the program is very good idea. He personally believes that the Committee should not leave it up to another agency to develop sign specs that will be used at the State level. Even the Committee has to stretch their limits to come up with a standard sign that will be good for the long run. Hamid added that he would not support to allow other agencies to develop signs that will be used on freeways and other public roadways.

Chairman Fisher stated that he does not have any conceptual problems with the scheme. We have signs which identify rivers and streams. He does not have any problem to stretch the use of that sign for watershed areas. The only question he has is if the Committee adopts this statewide, will other water agencies use the same signage if they choose to follow the program. If you can get support from other agencies indicating that they will use the same sign, then he will support the pilot program.

Gerry Meis asked how many signs would be installed on State Highways.

Bob stated six signs, because there are three watershed areas along the State highways.

John Fisher asked if members agreed to place this item on the agenda as an action item.

Six Committee members agreed to place the item on the agenda except Gerry Meis.

Farhad asked Bob to bring support from other agencies indicating that they would use the same sign and develop a policy where to use these signs.

Bob agreed to consult with other state water agencies and come up with policy for the sign that will be used statewide.

Johnny commented that this type of sign and a few current signs could be placed in a separate chapter. They are signs, however, they are not traffic control devices, so we can keep in a separate chapter.

Action: Place this item on the agenda for next CTCDC meeting as an action item.

Out of the Agenda Item:

Farhad Mansourian mentioned that the Public Works Directors, California Association of Counties and League of California Cities are meeting on March 1, 2 and 3 of 2006 in San Diego. He suggested that if Caltrans and FHWA puts out educational literature on the California MUTCD and any hot topic the Committee is dealing with, such as the California Older Driver Task Force. The Associations of Counties and Cities will provide the booth. He suggested that this is good tool to share with other agencies what the Committee is doing and also the issues related to the Older Driver can be shared with public agencies.

Chairman Fisher asked Johnny if it will be helpful if information would be available about the status of FHWA's standing on each item related to older drivers. Without that, it will be difficult for the Committee to make a decision. He also asked what language the Committee would be dealing with.

Johnny responded that he would provide an update on the FHWA standings on the issues related to older drivers.

Next Meeting: The Committee decided to have the next CTCDC meeting on February 23, 2006 in Northern California. The Committee will have a workshop to discuss MUTCD comments on February 1, 2006 and another workshop on February 22, 2006 to discuss California Older Driver Traffic Safety Task Force items.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 2:25 PM